



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/770,162	01/26/2001		La Vaughn F. Watts JR.	M-9875 US	8091
33438	7590	05/20/2005		EXAMINER	
HAMILTO	N & TEF	RRILE, LLP	YUN, EUGENE		
P.O. BOX 2				ADTIBUT	DADED MUMBED
AUSTIN, T	X 78720	}		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2682	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/770,162	WATTS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eugene Yun	2682	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address -	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ Thi	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under		·	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/a	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e: a) \square accepted or b) \square objected or by accepted or abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is obtained.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	, (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail D		

Art Unit: 2682

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau et al. (US 6,779,019) in view of Sagar (US 6,873,841).

Referring to Claim 1, Mousseau teaches a mobile computing system comprising of:

A common communication device 18 (fig. 1);

a personal computing system (PC) 10A (fig. 1) coupled to the common communication device, the PC including a storage device capable of receiving and storing messages from the communication device 30 (fig. 1); and

a personal digital assistant system (PDA) 24 (fig. 1) coupled to the common communication device, the PDA including a storage device capable receiving and storing messages from the communication device, whereby the storage device of the PC is capable of synchronizing messages received from the common communication device with the storage device of the PDA (see col. 6, lines 22-43).

Mousseau does not teach the PC and the PDA capable of controlling the common communication device, but one of the PC and PDA controlling the common communication device at a given time. Sagar teaches the PC and the PDA (see 102)

Art Unit: 2682

and 104 of fig. 1 also noting col. 2, lines 10-13) capable of controlling the common communication device 106 (fig. 1), but one of the PC and PDA controlling the common communication device at a given time (see col. 1, lines 58-67 and col. 2, lines 1-4 noting the one-way transfer of information between the first and second apparatus and vice versa). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide to teachings of Sagar to said device of Mousseau in order to provide convenience in data sharing between mobile and wireless devices.

Referring to Claim 2, Mousseau also teaches the storage device of the PC as a memory array comprised of a set of records, and the storage device of the PDA is a memory array comprised of a set of records (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 3, Mousseau also teaches direct correspondence established between the set of records of the PC memory array and the set of records of the PDA memory array (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 4, Mousseau also teaches messages synchronized between the memory array of the PC and the memory array of the PDA (see col. 7, lines 27-31).

Referring to Claim 5, Mousseau also teaches messages synchronized between the records of the PC memory array and records of the PDA memory array (see col. 7, lines 27-31).

Referring to Claim 6, Mousseau also teaches a hard disk drive 10A (fig. 1 noting that every desktop computer has a hard disk drive).

Art Unit: 2682

Referring to Claim 7, Mousseau also teaches the hard disk drive comprised of a memory array, and the PDA storage device comprised of a memory array, wherein the PC hard disk drive memory array corresponds directly to the PDA memory array (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Claim 8 has similar limitations as Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 9, Mousseau also teaches the PDA comprising a memory array where messages are received and entered, and the memory array is synchronized into the PC (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 10, Mousseau also teaches the PC comprised of a memory array synchronized to the memory array of the PDA (see col. 7, lines 32-43).

Referring to Claim 11, Mousseau also teaches PC comprised of a hard disk drive synchronized to the memory array of the PDA 10A (fig. 1 noting that every desktop computer has a hard disk drive).

Referring to Claim 12, Mousseau teaches a method of clearing and archiving messages in a dual system computer architecture, the dual system computer architecture including a first computer system 10A (fig. 1) coupled to a common communication device 18 (fig. 1) and a second computer system 24 (fig. 1) coupled to the common communication device, the method comprising:

receiving and storing messages by the first computer system to a first memory device 30 (fig. 1);

Art Unit: 2682

synchronizing the messages with the second computer system, whereby the second computer system archives synchronized messages to a second memory device (see col. 6, lines 22-43); and

deleting synchronized and archived messages whenever the first memory device is filled (see col. 23, lines 15-23).

Mousseau does not teach the first computer system and the second computer system being capable of controlling the common communication device with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time. Sagar teaches the first computer system and the second computer system (see 102 and 104 of fig. 1 also noting col. 2, lines 10-13) being capable of controlling the common communication device 106 (fig. 1) with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time (see col. 1, lines 58-67 and col. 2, lines 1-4 noting the one-way transfer of information between the first and second apparatus and vice versa). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide to teachings of Sagar to said device of Mousseau in order to provide convenience in data sharing between mobile and wireless devices.

Referring to Claim 13, Mousseau also teaches identifying the deleted messages in the first memory devices (see col. 23, lines 15-23).

Referring to Claim 16, Mousseau teaches a method of clearing and archiving messages in a dual system computer architecture, the dual system computer

Art Unit: 2682

architecture including a first computer system 10A (fig. 1) coupled to a common communication device 18 (fig. 1) and a second computer system 24 (fig. 1) coupled to the common communication device, the method comprising:

receiving and storing messages by the first computer system to a first memory device 30 (fig. 1);

synchronizing the messages with the second computer system, whereby the second computer system archives synchronized messages to a second memory device (see col. 6, lines 22-43); and

informing a user whenever the first memory device is filled (see col. 23, lines 15-23).

Mousseau does not teach the first computer system and the second computer system being capable of controlling the common communication device with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time. Sagar teaches the first computer system and the second computer system (see 102 and 104 of fig. 1 also noting col. 2, lines 10-13) being capable of controlling the common communication device 106 (fig. 1) with one of the first computer system and the second computer system controlling the common-communication device at a given time (see col. 1, lines 58-67 and col. 2, lines 1-4 noting the one-way transfer of information between the first and second apparatus and vice versa). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide to teachings of Sagar to said device of

Art Unit: 2682

Mousseau in order to provide convenience in data sharing between mobile and wireless devices.

Referring to Claim 17, Mousseau also teaches deleting messages from the first memory device after the messages have been read by the user (see col. 23, lines 1-5).

Referring to Claims 14, 15, 18, and 19, Mousseau also teaches the first computer system as a PDA and the second computer system as a PC (see fig. 1).

Referring to Claims 20-27, Mousseau also teaches setting preferences as to received and stored messages (see col. 24, lines 30-40).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 09/770,162 Page 8

Art Unit: 2682

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (571) 272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eugene Yun Examiner Art Unit 2682

EY

VIVIAN CHIN SUPERVII